

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**CHARLESTON DIVISION**

ANDRE` WILSON

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:13-cv-20692

CO ANDREW HUDSON, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER**


Pending before this court is the defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket 116]. The Motion for Summary Judgment was referred to the Honorable Dwane L. Tinsley, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (2012). On July 30, 2015, the Magistrate Judge submitted findings of fact and a recommendation that the court **GRANT** the Motion for Summary Judgment and dismiss this matter from the docket.

Neither party has filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations. A district court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." § 636(b)(1)(C). The court is not, however, required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). As the parties have not filed objections in this case, the court accepts and incorporates herein the findings and

recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and orders judgment consistent with the findings and recommendation. Accordingly, the court **GRANTS** the Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket 116]. The case is **DISMISSED** and hereby **STRICKEN** from the docket of this court.

The court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: August 20, 2015



JOSEPH R. GOODWIN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE